

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16, 18-50, and 52-56 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 6, 12, 15, 20, 25-27, 31-33, 36, 40, 45, and 49 have been amended. Claims 17 and 51 have been cancelled without prejudice. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-16, 18-50, and 52-56 are patentable over the art of record and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 1-16, 18-50, and 52-56.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Whipple for holding a telephone interview with their representative, Janaki K. Davda, on Monday, December 3, 2007. Proposed claim amendments to claim 1 and the rejection citing the Challenger reference was discussed. Applicants' agreed to consider amending the claims to further describe the web content manager and the enterprise content management system. No other agreement was reached.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-23, and 25-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al. in view of what was well known in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 1 describes an electronic content library configured to store a plurality of files, and to maintain revision history data for the files stored therein; a web content manager configured to publish one or more of the files stored in the electronic content library to a website, wherein the web content manager is configured to manage information available on a website; an enterprise content management system configured to check-out a selected file from the electronic content library upon a user's request, and to check-in an updated version of the selected file to the electronic content library, such that checking-in the updated version of the selected file causes the revision history data in the electronic content library to be updated, wherein the enterprise content management system is linked to the web content manager and includes the electronic content library, and wherein the enterprise content management system provides at least one of enhanced search capabilities, access control, revision history management, and workflow management; and an event trigger subsystem in the enterprise content management system configured to notify the web content manager of the updated version of the selected file in response to a modification to the selected file (e.g., Specification,

page 1, paragraph 3; page 6, paragraph 25; page 8, paragraphs 31, 38; Applicants' Figures 1A and 1B).

As described in Applicants' Specification, paragraph 25, a system has been developed that *integrates ECMS functionality, such as enhanced search capabilities, access control, revision history management and workflow management, with the website management functionality of a WCM*. Paragraph 25 also describes that this integrated system can be used to facilitate management of a website, such as a public website that is connected to the global computer network commonly referred to as the "Internet," or a private website that is connected to a limited number of users, such as an intranet.

On the other hand, the Challenger reference describes a web server and trigger monitor (Figure 7). Applicants respectfully submit that the Challenger reference does not describe an electronic content library configured to store a plurality of files, and to maintain revision history data for the files stored therein; a web content manager configured to publish one or more of the files stored in the electronic content library to a website, wherein the web content manager is configured to manage information available on a website; an enterprise content management system configured to check-out a selected file from the electronic content library upon a user's request, and to check-in an updated version of the selected file to the electronic content library, such that checking-in the updated version of the selected file causes the revision history data in the electronic content library to be updated, wherein the enterprise content management system is linked to the web content manager and includes the electronic content library, and wherein the enterprise content management system provides at least one of enhanced search capabilities, access control, revision history management, and workflow management; and an event trigger subsystem in the enterprise content management system configured to notify the web content manager of the updated version of the selected file in response to a modification to the selected file.

Claims 6, 15, 25, 33, 36, 40, and 49 are not taught or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2, 4-5, 7-11, 13-14, 16, 18-23, 25-32, 34-35, 37-39, 41-48, 50, and 52-56 each incorporate the language of one of independent claims 1, 6, 15, 25, 33, 36, 40, and 49 and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 4-5, 7-11, 13-14, 16, 18-23,

25-32, 34-35, 37-39, 41-48, 50, and 52-56 are not taught or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 6, 15, 25, 33, 36, 40, and 49.

Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger and further in view of Yuen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033037). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Yuen patent application does not cure the defects of the Challenger reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the Challenger reference and the Yuen patent application does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 6.

Dependent claims 3 and 12 incorporate the language of independent claims 1 and 6, respectively, and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 3 and 12 are not taught or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1 and 6.

Also, amended claim 3 describes determining that a user is authorized to check-out the selected file from the electronic content library using user authorization content, wherein the event trigger subsystem is further configured to disable selected content manager functions when the selected file is checked-out of the electronic content library based on permissions stored in the user authorization content (e.g., Specification, paragraph 50). Neither the Challenger nor the Yuen reference describes that a user is authorized to check-out the selected file from the electronic content library using user authorization content. Also, the Yuen patent application at paragraph 46 is cited as teaching disabling selected content manager functions. Applicants respectfully traverse. Paragraph 46 describes editing templates, which does not teach or suggest disabling selected content manager functions and does not teach or suggest disabling selected content manager functions when the selected file is checked-out of the electronic content library *based on permissions stored in the user authorization content*.

Claim 12 describes that the electronic content library is further configured to maintain access control data for the web-based and non-web-based electronic content stored therein using enterprise content management system user authorization content (paragraph 50). Applicants using enterprise content management system user authorization content respectfully submit that neither the Challenger nor the Yuen reference describes access control.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger and further in view of Norin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,253). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Norin patent does not cure the defects of the Challenger reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the Challenger reference and the Norin patent does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 15.

Dependent claim 24 incorporates the language of independent claim 15 and adds additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claim 15 are not taught or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claim 15.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-16, 18-50, and 52-56 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: December 3, 2007

By: /Janaki K. Davda/

Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7973
Fax: 310-556-7984